

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application.

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner has withdrawn his prior §103(a) rejection regarding the cited references of Slipy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,848,152) in view of Hansen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,370,362), and that the Examiner finds that Claims 6 and 7 still contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten to include the subject matter of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner now rejects Claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Slipy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,848,152) in view of the newly cited reference of Curtis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,847,806). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

With respect to the §103(a) rejection of Claim 1, the Examiner states that Slipy et al. teaches a replaceable sliding cover for a folder-type phone having all the elements of Claims 1-5, except for a sliding cover for a mobile phone, which is allegedly taught by Curtis et al. In contrast to Claim 1, Slipy et al. teaches a flip type phone having a replaceable faceplate, particularly shown in Figs. 20 and 21. The flip (or moveable element 1802 in Figs. 20 and 21) is not provided with any cover, much less a replaceable sliding cover as claimed in Claim 1. In addition, as seen in Figs. 20 and 21, the replaceable faceplate is snap-fit onto the body of the phone, and is not slidably replaceable by having a raised edge to mate with a slot on the main body, as recited in the claims. Furthermore, while Curtis et al. may teach a sliding rear cover 3 for a bar type phone, the sliding rear cover 3 is only releasably attachable to the lower portion of the inner housing 4 by means of a slidable coupling, and does not cover the upper portion of a folder. In addition, the sliding rear cover 3 of Curtis et al. is only detachable from the inner housing 4, and is not detachable from the folder. As seen in Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 33-40, the front cover of Curtis et al. is snap-fit onto the upper portion of the inner housing 4, and only covers the inner housing.

The front and rear covers 2, 3 of Curtis et al., when combined with Slipy et al., do not provide a slot formed around the periphery of the folder, nor do they provide a raised edge for

mating with the slot. The covers 2, 3 of Curtis et al. provide a detachable housing for covering the inner housing 4 of the bar type phone, not for covering the folder of the folder type phone. The combination of Slipy et al. and Curtis et al. fails to teach or suggest the replaceable sliding cover of Claim 1.

Accordingly, neither Slipy et al. nor Curtis et al. teach a replaceable sliding cover for a folder-type phone having a slot formed around the periphery of the folder to cover the upper portion of a folder, as claimed in Claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-7 depend from independent Claim 1. As such, dependent Claims 2-7 should also be in condition for allowance.

In view of the preceding remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims, namely, Claims 1-7, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/JWK